



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

Dee, Mike (2013) Public Space and the Marginalisation of Children and Young People. In *Conference Proceedings : The Inaugural European Conference on the Social Sciences 2013*, IAFOR (International Academic Forum), Brighton, United Kingdom.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/66830/>

© Copyright 2013 Please consult the author

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

Urban Public Space and the Exclusion of Children and Young People

Abstract

Throughout much of the world, urban and rural public spaces may be said to be under attack by property developers, commercial interests and also attempts by civic authorities to regulate, restrict, reframe and rebrand these spaces. A consequence of the increasingly security driven, privatised, commercial and surveilled nature of public space is the exclusion and displacement of those considered 'flawed' and unwelcome in the 'spectacular' consumption spaces of many major urban centres. In the name of urban regeneration, processes of securitisation, 'gentrification' and creative cities initiatives can act to refashion public space as sites of selective inclusion and exclusion.

The use of surveillance and other control technologies as deployed in and around the UK 'Riots' of 2011 may help to promote and encourage a passing sense of personal safety and confidence in using public space. Through systems of social sorting, the same surveillance assemblages can also further the physical, emotional and psychological exclusion of certain groups and individuals, deemed to be both 'out of time and out of place' in major zones of urban, conspicuous, consumption.

In this harsh environment of monitoring and control procedures, children and young people's use of public spaces and places in parks, neighbourhoods, shopping malls and streets is often viewed as a threat to social order, requiring various forms of punitive and/or remedial action. Much of this civic action actively excludes some children and young people from participation and as a consequence, their trust in local processes and communities is eroded.

This paper discusses worldwide developments in the surveillance, governance and control of the public space environments used by children and young people in particular and the capacity for their displacement and marginality, diminishing their sense of belonging, wellbeing and rights to public space as an expression of their social, political and civil citizenship(s).

Key words

CCTV, Citizenship, Surveillance, Children, Young People, Public Space

Introduction

The use of public space by children and young people is a contentious issue in a number of countries and a range of measures deployed to control public space can deny the rights of children and young people to claim the space for their use (Dee 2012, Loader 1996). Curfews, oppressive camera surveillance and at times, the unwarranted attentions of police and private security personnel, undermine attempts to secure greater participation by children and young people in constructing positive strategies to address concerns that impact on them and others in a local area (White 1990, 1996, White and Wyn 2004). What is clear from current analyses is that public space for children and young people is under attack 'Public space itself has come under attack from several directions-thematisation, enclosure into malls and other controlled spaces, and privatization, or from urban planning and design interventions to erase its uniqueness' (Watson 2006:147). In this way 'Young urbanites form a marginalised age class. Their movement is restricted, out of fear and distrust, within aims to protect, monitored by city surveillance methods within the security-obsessed fabric' (Scott 2002:306).

Moreover, 'Positioned as aliens in the social and physical architecture of our cities, young people in Australia are portrayed through media and police campaigns as deviant, barbaric and unclean-a threat to social order' (Malone 2002:87). Official depictions of 'troubling youth' act as a screen on which observers and analysts project hopes and fears about the state of society (Davis 1995) and sits within a discourse of youth, particularly young males, as the 'harbinger of often unwelcome social change and threat'. This discourse contradictorily also 'constructs young people as vulnerable' (Loader 1996:89). The discourse of threat is further exemplified in the separation of children from teenagers, where the treatment of younger children using public space is often dramatically different to that of older children and the most feared stage of all, 'youth' especially if 'hoody wearers' (Parkes and Connolly 2011:412). For Valentine (1996) the situation is thus:

While adults treat younger children in public spaces as innocent, endearing yet sometimes exasperating incompetents, treat older children as unengaging and frightfully undisciplined rogues. Among other things, the very violation of public etiquette that adults often find amusing when committed by younger children are treated as dangerous moral failings when the transgressor is a few years older (p.132).

Increasingly, both children and young people are 'among those undesirable 'others' being driven out of public space by private security forces' (Valentine 1996:65). An important cluster of issues are evident here, as children and young people are 'selectively constructed as "problem" and "other" with their concerns marginalised, their lifestyles problematised and their voices subdued', and this flows into their use of public space as their claims to it as an aspect of social citizenship, are usually cast as inferior or rejected as they 'stand outside the formal polity' as 'non persons' (Brown 1998:116). Such marginalisation has implications for the ways some children and young people view their position in a community and over 40 per cent in my doctoral study reported feelings of not being wanted or liked (Dee 2008).

Public space is a contested reality and concept and a range of users exist and have different levels of access to and occupation of public space, depending on their power and societal status (Wilson, Rose and Colvin 2010). A way of categorising public space is suggested by Tonkiss (2005:67) in *the square* indicating 'collective belonging', *the café* 'representing social exchange' and *the street*, a place marked by 'informal encounter'. The square is any public space 'provided or protected by the state' and is formally (if not actually) open to all 'as a simple expression of citizenship'. The second kind of space facilitates contact between humans in a broadly social setting that can be a public or private space. The third form of space, the street, is seen as the 'basic unit of public life', a routine if necessary conduit for 'marginal encounters' based on equal rights to be in public space (Tonkiss 2005: 68).

Public space bears the imprint of the dominant order and this contested space also acts as a key site of resistance by subordinate groups (Crane and Dee 2001, Copeland 2004). Cunneen (2001:182) refers to a 'spatial politics' wherein Australian Indigenous people are constructed as a criminal and 'untidy' group to be removed where possible from public spaces and places of their choosing. There are important points for non-Indigenous people here also, if judged as not consuming goods and services in an appropriate manner or simply being as Norris and Armstrong (1998:142) note in relation to young people, 'out of time and out of place'.

The position of young people is one largely of constrained rights, where they frequently find themselves as the inferior party in respect of disputes within local communities over rights to use and occupy public space, which adults presume to exercise as a right of citizenship (Loader 1995). The usual starting point for a discussion about citizenship rights is Marshall

(1950). He theorizes citizenship as comprising three stages of broad historical evolution towards civil, political and social rights. Civil citizenship, from the eighteenth century onwards, is the right to personal freedom in the form of speech, movement and assembly. Political citizenship, emerging in the nineteenth century, is the right to vote and stand for public office. Social citizenship, a creation of the twentieth century includes economic security and access to health, education and employment opportunities. Social citizenship rights are largely about quality of life issues and human dignity, guaranteed by the welfare state to ensure that individuals have the material wherewithal to take full part in society.

Civil, political and social citizenship rights are all relevant to children and young people as users of public space and link to a form of 'spatial citizenship' in terms of liveability, social, spatial and emotional well-being and sustainability (Rowntree Foundation 2009) and these are necessary elements of becoming 'satisfactory' citizens in the broadest sense, as indicated by Jacobs (1965):

The tolerance, the room for great difference among neighbours-differences that often go far deeper than differences in colour are possible and normal only when streets of great cities have built-in equipment allowing strangers to dwell in peace together on civilised but essentially dignified and reserved terms. Lowly unpurposeful and random as they may appear, sidewalk contacts are the small change from which a city's wealth of public life may grow (p.48).

The perception by young people that they are excluded from participation in community life and decision making is considered by Measor and Squires (2000) in their study of children and young people 'congregating' in public spaces in Brighton in the U.K. They point to a central concern posited by them over a lack of consultation on community planning, infrastructure and developments. The young people reported a demonstrable sense of marginalisation and exclusion from community life as Measor and Squires (2000:256) comment 'All too often young people were talked about, typically they were talked about as a problem. Rather less often they were talked to, still less did they appear to be listened to'. This is supported by my own doctoral research undertaken with 1100 high school students in Brisbane and nearby Logan City, where a profound sense of wanting to be a valued part of their local communities was evident (Dee 2008). The importance of place, space and neighbourhood or 'place-rootedness' (Leonard 2006:234) to the physical and emotional maturity and well being of children and young people and development of a 'place-bound identity' (Laughlin and Johnson 2011:440) is now strongly established (Sibley 1995, Lynch 1977, 1984, Freeman 2002, 2010). However, the richness and complexity of their use of a range of public and semi-public spaces is often downplayed or dismissed by those for whom public space is an adult territory (Valentine 2004, Iveson 2006).

Not merely 'under catered for in public open spaces' (Woolley 2006:55) it can be said that children and young people (to varying extents due to age, location and socio-economic factors) are driven from 'the street into their bedrooms' (Summers 1995:9) where they are no longer 'free-range more battery-reared' (McNeish and Roberts 1995:3). Not only is their marginalisation from public space exacerbated, but their marginalisation from citizenship, as mere 'citizens- in- the- making' and their active role in making and re-making public space or the 'micro-spaces of citizenship' also goes largely unregarded, but not unwatched, through camera and other electronic surveillance through child protection (Weller 2007, Dee 2008).

Surveillance

A number of western democratic countries can be understood as 'surveillance societies' (Lyon 1994, 2001). The nature of the surveillance is complex and far-reaching and needs to be set in the broadest context of everyday acts, including shopping in malls and streets, using shop loyalty cards, paying for goods with an *Electronic funds transfer at point of sale* (EFTPOS) card, using mobile phones and global positioning systems (GPS), paying utility bills, interfacing with any level of government, logging on to computers, the internet, etc.

Surveillance as information gathering and storage is not a feature only of modernity or post modernity. A 'simple and ancient' form of data compilation may be discerned in England in the 1500s, in taxation, census and early poor law administration. This inaugural moment in the creation of the surveillance state built a provisional infrastructure for social control, for example, over religious orders, 'heretics, devils and witches' (Marx 2004: 17), the categorisation and sanctioning of the 'deserving and undeserving' poor (Kennedy 1982: 153) and workers organising for better pay and conditions (Lyon 2002).

Surveillance is multi-faceted, for the infrastructure which records 'private' telephone conversations via an orbiting satellite and matches client data across welfare and policing agencies, can also protect liberty, support social justice and encourage 'participation in political life' (Lyon 2002:4). The extent of seemingly altruistic surveillance applications means that its negative aspects are frequently disputed or minimised by advocates for greater surveillance powers (Lyon 2002:4). The phenomenon of routine mass surveillance largely coincides with the emergence of the 'risk society'. In Beck's formulation, this comes about when the 'social, political, ecological, and individual risks created by the momentum of innovation elude increasingly the control and protective institutions of industrial society' (Beck 1992: 27). Importantly and as this paper suggests, the surveillance gaze (in all its forms) does not fall evenly on all citizens as Norris and Armstrong (1999) established in relation to the CCTV surveillance of urban poor young people.

For many commentators awareness of the routine CCTV surveillance of urban areas was first signalled by the 1993 murder in the UK of the child, Jamie Bulger (Norris and Armstrong 1999, Walby 2006). The media coverage of the murder brought it to television screens across the globe and the blurred CCTV footage from the roof of the Liverpool shopping centre indicated the power of CCTV not to prevent crime, but to parade the suspects, themselves children, before the nation (Finer and Nellis 1998, Dee 2000). The aftermath of the Bulger murder helped to spark a massive investment in UK CCTV infrastructure totalling more than 21 billion pounds between 1985 and 1999 and beyond (Stedman 2011).

The current state of play suggests in excess of 4.2 million cameras (there are too many to accurately count them) or 1 camera for every 14 persons in the UK population, such that in a typical busy street 'a person could have their image captured by over 300 cameras on over thirty separate CCTV systems' (Norris, McCahill and Wood 2004:112, Institute for Public Policy Research 2006).

In Australia, broadly similar developments are in train, with CCTV in some schools since 1997, with a Victorian secondary college covertly installing cameras in a male toilet block to counter alleged illicit drug use (Kelly 2003). A report for the Australian Institute of Criminology (ACI) notes that following the first open street CCTV system in Perth in 1991, CCTV systems now operate in all capital city, regional and suburban centres. They express concern at the warm, largely unquestioning embrace of CCTV, given the scant evaluation of cost effectiveness undertaken by local councils and the questionable net benefits of CCTV over other policing strategies (Wilson and Sutton 2003, Wells, Allard and Wilson 2006).

The lack of a broad political will to critically evaluate the effectiveness of CCTV flows from assumptions that it is popular with the bulk of the electorate, being 'what people want'. This assertion was made by Ian Greenwood, then leader of Bradford City Council, Yorkshire, England in 1998 when he stated that 'There will be no evaluation (of the existing camera system) we are committed to CCTV; there will be money spent on it; it is popular with working people' (Hussein 1998:4). This is an important division drawn between 'working people' and the category of the 'other(ed)' such as the young unemployed. The propensity of CCTV surveillance to act as a lens of discrimination is further suggested in this comment from a local councillor in Newcastle (U.K.), on the case for a CCTV system on the West End estate (KDIS Online 1999 www.brs.legend.org.uk):

It's to do with the kind of community you have here. You have a problem of loose families. Single mothers, men who drift around. There is a dislocation from normal expectations, from normal manners, if you like, a breakdown of basic rules and social codes. What do you do with working-class men who no longer have any possibility of a job and no means of earning self-respect? They are too poor, and too poorly educated to take collective responsibility for their own problems. To some extent, I suppose, the cameras are a form of containment.

This observation holds normative assumptions which cannot detain us here, but Norris and Armstrong (1999) studied three English CCTV systems, with 148 cameras over 592 hours of observation in control rooms, finding that the young, the male and the black, were systematically targeted, (by CCTV surveillance) not because of their involvement in crime or disorder, but for 'no obvious reason'. Forty per cent were targeted on the basis of 'belonging to a particular or subcultural group' with black people more than twice as likely to be surveilled than others, and for longer time periods (Norris and Armstrong 1999:150).

Despite widespread reluctance to critically evaluate CCTV systems, the rush to install them continues apace, alongside the constant upgrading of system functionality, from loudspeakers to web based storage of images, encouraged by a lucrative even rapacious, security industry (Baldry and Painter 1998). In Britain the networking of a range of camera systems, from traffic, congestion charging, to open street private and public surveillance, lurches towards an integrated national surveillance network, with few controls (Geraghty 2000, Stedman 2011). In Australia the proliferation of CCTV systems in the UK and Europe (Urban Eye 2004) is something of an aspirational benchmark and there are moves by the *National Counter-Terrorism Committee* to gain access to 'every CCTV camera in Australia' and via CrimTrac (operator of all police databases) establish a national facial recognition database to maximize developments in facial recognition technology (Parnell 2011:3).

The intensification of surveillance marks a transition from older, mainly paper based methods to 'new' data based surveillance or 'scrutiny through the use of technical means to extract or create personal or group data, whether from individuals or contexts' (Marx 2005: 2) and includes DNA analysis, data profiling, matching and mining, CCTV with enhanced definition and predictive functionality and imaging and scanning capabilities (Marx 2004). Regimes of new surveillance (unlike traditional surveillance) can be undertaken at a distance (such as aerial drones equipped with CCTV, sound recording and public address capabilities) with 'sponge-like absorbency and laser-like specificity' and require self surveillance and the surveillance of others, for example in the workplace or the community (Marx 2005:3).

However, questions of power, governance and democracy in relation to the development and deployment of surveillance measures remain. While on one level, surveillance is 'the collection and processing of personal data, whether identifiable or not, for the purposes of

influencing or managing those whose data have been garnered' (Lyon 2001:2), at another level, surveillance 'tries to make visible the identities or behaviours of people of interest to the agency in question' (Lyon 2002:2). The work of Foucault (1974, 1977), provides critical insight here for the further interrogation of issues of power, information and surveillance.

Foucault was concerned with Bentham's invention of the Panopticon or Inspection House, based on an isolated, regularly structured place in which the individual is subjugated to the norms of work, education and discipline (Haggerty and Ericson 2006). Situated within the Panopticon, it is possible to sanction or reward the individual for their behaviour, as all activities are monitored. It is this surveillance gaze, received, internalised and at least in part embraced, by the subject-object that is fundamental to the exercise by authorities of surveillant power (Foucault 1977):

There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against himself (p.155).

Young people: under (marginalising) surveillance

The concept of the Panopticon is related by Malone (2002), to the discourse of 'threatening youth' where certain young people, never quite sure if they are under surveillance, act to surveil themselves and the actions of other children and young people. Familial surveillance is also a requirement for families with dependants subject to Anti-Social Behaviour Orders or 'ASBO's' in the UK (Squires and Stephen 2005). In this way, ASBOs act to both internalise and normalise the surveillance gaze, turning it inward on a families' own children, often on pain of penalty if the object of the panoptic gaze should escape the modern home-cum - entertainment -cum detention centre (Kearns and Collins 2004, Valentine 2004).

While researchers argue that surveillance is not inherently designed to perpetuate inequality, they also note that in contemporary society, where everyone is subject to some forms of surveillance 'not everyone is monitored in the same way or for the same purposes' (Gilliom 2001, Henman 2004, Haggerty & Ericson, 2006). However, surveillance is more than just watching, it is 'a calculated practice for managing and manipulating human behaviour' (Henman 2004:176) and surveillance practices tend more often than not, to 'coagulate more heavily on the more disadvantaged members of society' such as young people (Henman and Marston 2008:201). Surveillance of the kinds discussed in this paper acts as a conduit through which 'the preventative-surveillance state' becomes deeply embedded and also 'broader, more interventive and more regulatory' (Parton 2008:166).

Children and young people are highly visible users of urban public space as they have limited resources to effectively shield their presence from public view (White 1990, Dee 1995, Loader 1996, Crane and Dee 2001). Public space hails them with the (often false) promise of inclusion and fulfilment through consumption (Iveson 1998, White 1990, Shields 1992.). Their "visibleness" (Dwyer 2010:2) is a key issue for civic authorities increasingly concerned not just with what they do or *might* do in public space, but with what they wear including the now infamous 'hoody' recently the subject of a proposed ban in the Brisbane suburb of Wynnum (Baskin 2011). Young people (along with a number of 'out' groups such as the homeless, poor and at times, older people) are 'positioned as 'other' in the social and physical architecture of our cities' (Malone and Hasluck 1998:26) and are at the receiving end of a multitude of 'exclusionary practices' (Kulynych 2001, White 2006).

As frequent 'hanging out' (White 1998) users of public space, children and young people are the target of a range of surveillance and control strategies including being 'moved on' (Spooner 2001) 'over policed' (Blagg and Wilkie 1995), 'under policed' (Loader 1996) and in the UK, subject to 'Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, Dispersal Orders and Curfew Orders' (Flint 2006:53). As Norris and Armstrong (1999) noted presciently, the CCTV surveillance-control gaze is far from neutral:

The gaze of the cameras does not fall equally on all users of the street but on those who are stereotypically predefined as potentially deviant, or through appearance and demeanour, are singled out by operators as unrespectable. In this way youth, particularly those already socially and economically marginal, may be subject to even greater levels of authoritative intervention and official stigmatisation, and rather than contributing to social justice through the reduction of victimisation, CCTV will merely become a tool of injustice through the amplification of differential and discriminatory policing (p.279).

In addition to CCTV, there are recent innovations in the repertoire of public space controls such as the *mosquito*, a device emitting a high pitched noise directly targeting children and young people under the age of 25 because their hearing is not yet fully developed (Institute for Public Policy Research 2006). Clearly such a blunt instrument with blanket coverage over a forty metre range fails to differentiate fairly between groups or individual children and young people and more importantly, brooks no discussion about rights to use and enjoy public space in the same way that other age groups do (Morrow 2002). There is now a substantial body of critical material pointing to a social sorting and ordering of public space (Zurawski and Czerwinski 2008) by civic authorities around the world that is almost entirely driven by support for 'conspicuous consumption' and the exclusion, or at best, conditional inclusion, of 'flawed consumers' or 'vagabonds' (Baumann 1998:14).

New urban spaces are configured by design to accommodate CCTV which in a drive for 'ubiquity' is now the 'fifth utility' (Graham and Marvin 2001:247) and older urban spaces are retrofitted for surveillance at considerable public expense (Clancy 2009). As a result, landscapes have become *Scanscapes* (Hubbard 2006:249) where the electronic eyes of surveillance achieve a near totalising or 'panoptic' gaze (Lyon 2002:10). The increasing control and regulation of public space in Australia was noted by White (1996:37) as the 'Fortress City' comprising many of the features discussed by Davis (1995:24) as the fortification and 'destruction of public space' including shopping malls, transforming public space into 'mass private property' (White 1996:246). Shopping malls now act as 'de facto community centres' and increasingly pose as town squares (Shields 1992:4, Flint 2006) with 'paid for' seating in coffee shops (Dee 2008:250) and may include modified seating to prevent sleeping, camera surveillance, an oppressive security presence, absence of declared or equitable shopping centre rules, and even resort to the playing of classical music which 'could chase young people away' apparently making 'such places safer' (*Adelaide Advertiser* 15.05.1995 cited in White 1996:42).

The installation of ever more sophisticated, extensive and costly CCTV systems in a form of 'surveillance creep' (Nelkin and Andrews 2003:17) into 'every village, parish and hamlet' (Walby 2006:40) is seemingly a 'badge of honour' for civic authorities desperate to be seen as decisive and 'doing something' about crime and so called anti-social behaviour (Garland 2001), often featuring in promotional documentation boasting of a safer city or town because of CCTV (White 2002:23).

Any serious ‘wannabe global city’ (Clavell 2011:525) simply must have comprehensive CCTV surveillance for the Central Business District (CBD) area and peripheral zones to help contain street crime and also combat terrorism (Atkinson and Easthope 2009, Clavell 2011). Decisions about the installation and/or extension-upgrade of CCTV systems are barely concerned with questions of civil liberties and largely devoted to obtaining a technical fix to irksome and persistent urban issues whose antecedence may lie in poverty and disadvantage but through reconstruction, become matters of governance and control on behalf of ‘the responsible majority’ as Clavell (2011) notes:

CCTV has become an increasingly popular policy solution to security problems in urban environments: as part of a broader project to promote ‘civility’ and eliminate ‘anti-social behaviour’. The need to impose ‘proper behaviour’ and sanction deviance is the discourse used to justify and legitimize the need to control what people do in open, public space through the electronic lens-as well as an increased police presence and powers (p.525).

The role of CCTV surveillance is central to attempts to govern and contain the potentially ‘dangerous classes’ (White 1990, MacDonald 1997) who are financially poor or simply maladapted to fit well within the required neo-liberal value set of ‘gentrified’ and ‘creative cities’ as places fit for conspicuous consumption (Atkinson and Easthope 2009:71). Efforts to erect ‘rings of steel’ around CBD areas to give comfort to desired users of public with pledges of ‘safe’ family shopping/entertainment/lifestyle environments are sustained at public expense to ensure private accumulation and often run counter to civic advertising playing on the importance of ‘celebrating diversity’ and the inclusion of all in ‘the community’ including children and young people (Dee 2008, Doherty et al 2008).

Conclusion

The key points emerging from this discussion seek to contribute to ongoing debate and analysis of the role of CCTV surveillance and associated public space control measures in urban governance in Australia and elsewhere. This paper has charted the rise and rise of CCTV and also of a surveillance culture, now firmly, possibly irrevocably, sutured into the repertoire of governance and control strategies deployed by urban authorities in many jurisdictions. It may not be too overheated to suggest the advent of a security-industrial complex in tandem with an already powerful prison-industrial complex with commonalities of personnel, ideology and perspectives on maintaining a compliant and conservative social order in densely populated urban spaces and places (Lyon 1994, Goold 2006, Hubbard 2006).

Tensions frequently occur when children and young people seek to make use of a multitude of public spaces (Loader 1996; White 1999; Valentine 2004). Rarely, if ever, are children and young people involved in meaningful ways in the design and control of public space that reflects their needs and aspirations (White 1999; Freeman and Riordan 2002; Freeman 2006). Deploying the prisms of urban planning and law and order to deal with perceived public space issues impacts adversely on children and young people contributing to their partial or complete removal from public space (Harris 2006; Waiton 2001) and their ongoing marginalisation as legitimate actors in public space and as competent citizens (Weller 2007).

A key problem exists in the capacity of modern, urban public space/place to genuinely accommodate children and young people’s need to experience excitement and fun in what

has been termed “unprogrammed space” (Lynch 1977:71), or simply to ‘hang out’ in unstructured social space, with control by civic authorities a key concern (Valentine 1996, 2004, Gleeson 2006). The recent death of the so called ‘Goony Kids’ in Melbourne sparked the comment that ‘There are no meaningful spaces where young people can gather, where they feel they have a sense of belonging and feel like they’re accepted’ (*The Weekend Australian* 10-11/11/2012). For many children and young people, it often seems that there are few places for them to go, or their experiences of attempting to use public space are marred by denial of everyday rights and courtesies, in ‘unfriendly’ and expensive commercial spaces.

Fundamental questions are raised about the form and meaning of urban citizenship and participation particularly by children and young people in the face of increasingly militaristic, hostile and technologically advanced (if democratically replete) exclusionary measures (Davis 1995, Fopp 2002, White and Wyn 2004). The consequences of attempting to make urban places ‘safe’ for approved activities and social actors may become self defeating in the forcible exclusion of so many ‘dangerous others’ (Watson 2006:65, Valentine 2004), that the public space remaining is bereft of any excitement, or real diversity and difference.

In this way ‘safe’ public space becomes predictable and patterned, largely as civic authorities and corporate entities require it to be, but lacking in the nurturing of engagement and social citizenship of encountering and understanding difference and practicing tolerance, essential elements of a confident and sophisticated urban population (Jacobs 1965, Sennett 1976, 1996, 2004). Conversely, it can be said that places that work well for children and young people, that have a good level of amenity and provision, that are genuinely inclusive, go a long way to meeting the needs of *all* users of public space (Mitchell 2003, Dee 2008, Freeman 2006).

References

- Atkinson, R. & Easthope, H. (2009). The consequences of the Creative Class: The Pursuit of Creativity Strategies in Australia's Cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Volume 33.1 March 2009 64-79.
- Baldrey, P., & Painter, K. (1998). Watching Them Watching Us. *The Surveyor*.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Work, consumerism and the new poor*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Work, consumerism and the new poor*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Blagg, H., Wilkie, M., & Australian Youth Foundation. (1995). *Young people and police powers*. Sydney: The Australian Youth Foundation.
- Brown, S. (1998). *Understanding youth and crime-Listening to youth?* Open University Press: Buckingham.
- Clancy, G. (2009) Considerations for establishing a public space CCTV network. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology,
- Copeland, A. Public Space A rights-based approach. (2004) *Youth Studies Australia*, 23(3), 40-45.
- Crane, P. & Dee, M. (2001). Young people, public space & New Urbanism. *Youth Studies Australia*, 20(1), 11-18.
- Cunneen, C. (2001). *Conflict, Politics and Crime-Aboriginal Communities and the Police*. NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Davis, M. (1995). Fortress Los Angeles: The Militarization of Urban Space. In P. Kasinitz (Ed.), *Metropolis Centre and Symbol of our Times*. London: Macmillan.
- Dee, M. (2000). *The use of CCTV to police public Spaces: A case of Big Brother or Big Friend?* Paper Presented at the 27th International Conference on Making Cities Liveable, Vienna Town Hall, Austria, July 2000.
- Dee, M. (2008). Young People, Public Space and Citizenship. Unpublished PhD thesis, Queensland University of Technology.
- Dwyer, A. (2009). Visibly Invisible: Policing Queer Young People As A Research Gap. ae.dwyer@qut.edu.au
- Finer, C. & Nellis, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Crime and Social Exclusion*. Oxford Blackwell.
- Flack, M. More eyes on Logan. *Albert and Logan News* 21 July 2011, p.4.
- Flint, J. (2006). Surveillance and exclusion practices in the governance of access to shopping centres on periphery estates in the UK. *Surveillance and Society*, 4(1/2): 52-68.

- Fopp, R. (2002). Increasing the Potential for Gaze, Surveillance and Normalisation: the transformation of an Australian policy for people who are homeless. *Surveillance and Society*, 1(1), 48-65.
- Foucault, M. (1974). *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allan Lane.
- Freeman, C. (2006). Colliding worlds: planning with children and young people for better cities. In Gleeson, B & Snipe, N. (Eds.), *Creating Child Friendly Cities*. London: Routledge.
- Freeman, C. and Riordan, T. (2002). Locating Skateparks: The Planners Dilemma. *Planning Practice & Research*, 17(3), 297-316.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geraghty, T. (2000). *The Irish War*. London: Harper Collins.
- Gilliom, J. (2001). *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance, Resistance, and the Limits of Privacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gleeson, B. (2006). Australia's toxic cities: modernity's paradox. In Gleeson, B. & Snipe, N. (Eds.), *Creating Child Friendly Cities*. London: Routledge.
- Goold, B.J. (2006). Open to all? Regulating Open Street CCTV and the Case for "Symmetrical Surveillance". *Criminal Justice Ethics*. Winter 2006; 25;1; Academic Research Library.
- Graham, S. (1998). Spaces of surveillant simulation: new technologies, digital representations, and material geographies. *Environment and Planning*, 16, 483-504.
- Graham, S. & Marvin, S. (2001). *Splintering Urbanism*. London: Routledge.
- Graham, S. and Wood, D. (2003). Digitizing Surveillance: Categorization, Space, Inequality. *Critical Social Policy*, Vol. 23(2):227-248.
- Haggerty, K. and Ericson, R. 2006. *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Harris, A. (2013). *Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism*. London: Routledge.
- Henman, P. and Adler, M. (2003). Information technology and the governance of social security. *Critical Social Policy*, Vol. 23(2):139-164.
- Henman, P. (2004). Population Segmentation, Electronic Surveillance and Governing the Unemployed in Australia, *International Sociology*, 19(2): 173-191.
- Henman, P. and Marston, G. (2008). The social division of welfare surveillance, *Journal of Social Policy*, 37(2): 187-206.

- Hubbard, P. (2006). *City*. London: Routledge.
- Hussein, S. (1 December 1998). More spy-cameras on the way. *Bradford Telegraph and Argus*, p.4.
- Institute for Public Policy Research. (2006). *Cafe Politique: Big Brother policing: CCTV and Surveillance*. Retrieved 8 December 2006: www.ippr.org.uk
- Iveson, K. (2006). Cities for angry young people? In Gleeson, B. & Snipe, N. (Eds.), *Creating Child Friendly Cities*. London: Routledge.
- Iveson, K. (1998). Putting The Public Back Into Public Space. *Urban Policy and Research*, 16 (1), 21-29.
- Jacobs, J. (1965). *The Life and Death of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.
- (KDIS Online 1999 www.brs.legend.org.uk)
- Kearns, R. & Collins, D. (2006). Children in the intensifying city: lessons from Auckland's walking school buses. In Gleeson, B. & Snipe, N. (Eds.), *Creating Child Friendly Cities*. London: Routledge.
- Kelly, P. (2003). Growing Up as Risky Business? Risks, Surveillance and the Institutionalized Mistrust of Youth. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6(2), 165-180.
- Kennedy, R. (1982). *Australian Welfare History-Critical Essays*. South Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Kulynych, J. (2001). No playing in the public sphere: Democratic theory and the exclusion of children. *Social Theory and Practice*, 27(2), 231-264.
- Loader, I. (1996). *Youth, Policing and Democracy*. London: Macmillan.
- Lynch, K. (1977). *Growing Up in Cities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lynch, K. (1984). *Good City Form*. London: The MIT Press.
- Lyon, D. (2002). Surveillance Studies: Understanding visibility, mobility and the phenetic fix. *Surveillance and Society*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Lyon, D. (2001). *Surveillance Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Lyon, D. (1994). *The Electronic Eye-The Rise of Surveillance Society*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- MacDonald, R. (Ed.). (1997). *Youth, the 'Underclass' and Social Exclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Malone, K. (2002). Street life: youth, culture and competing uses of public space. *Environment and Urbanization*, 14 (2), 157-168.
- Malone, K. & Hasluck, L. (2002). Australian Youth. In L. Chawla (Ed.), *Growing Up in an Urbanising World*. London: UNESCO/Earthscan Publications.

- Malone, K. & Hasluck, L. (2008). Geographies of Exclusion. *Family Matters No. 49 Autumn 1998*. Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Marshall, T. H., & Bottomore, T. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto.
- Marx, G.T. (2003) A Tack in the Shoe: Neutralizing and Resisting the New Surveillance, *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol 59, No 2, pp.369-390.
- Marx, G.T. (2002) What's New About the "New Surveillance"? Classifying for Change and Continuity, *Surveillance and Society*, 1 (1), 9-29.
- Measor, L., & Squires, P. (2000). *Young people and community safety: inclusion, risk, tolerance and disorder*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mitchell, D. (2003). *The Right To The City*. London: The Guildford Press.
- Morrow, V. (2002). Children's rights to public space: environment and curfews. In B. Franklin (Ed.), *The New Handbook of Children's Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Nelkin, D. & Andrews, L. (2003). *Surveillance creep in the genetic age*. In Lyon, D. (ed.) *Surveillance as Social Sorting*. London: Routledge.
- Norris, C. and Armstrong, G. (1999). *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The rise of CCTV*. Oxford: Berg.
- Norris, C., McCahill, M., & Wood, D. (2004). The Growth of CCTV: A global perspective on the international diffusion of video surveillance in publicly accessible space. *Surveillance and Society*, 2(2/3): 110-135.
- Parnell, S. (2011). Agencies demand access to all CCTV. *The Australian*. 10 August 2011.
- Rowntree Foundation, the Joseph (2011). The social value of public spaces. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
- Scott, C. (2002). Citizenship education: who pays the piper? In B. Franklin (Ed.), *The New Handbook of Children's Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Sennett, R. (2004). *Respect: The Formation of Character in an age of inequality*. New York: Norton.
- Sennett, R. (1996). *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Sennett, R. (1976). *The Fall of Public Man*. New York: Knopf. Short, J. (1989). *The Humane City*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Shields, R. (1992). *Lifestyle Shopping: The Subject of Consumption*. London: Routledge.

- Sibley, D. (1995). *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*. London: Routledge.
- Spooner, P. (2001). *Moving in the wrong direction: An analysis of police move-on powers in Queensland*. *Youth Studies Australia*, 20(1), 27-31.
- Stedman, A. (2011). The camera never lies, or does it? The dangers of taking CCTV surveillance at face value. *Surveillance and Society*, 8(4): 527-534.
- Squires, P., & Stephen, D. (2005). Rethinking ASBOs. *Critical Social Policy*, 25(4), 517-528.
- Tonkiss, F. (2005). *Space, the City and Social Theory*. Cambridge and New York: Polity Press.
- Urbaneye (2004). On the Threshold to Urban Panopticon? Analysing the Employment of CCTV in European Cities and Assessing its Social and Political Impacts. Final Report to the European Union, Technical University of Berlin.
- Valentine, G. (2004). *Public Space and the Culture of Childhood*. Aldershot and New York: Ashgate.
- Valentine, G. (1996). Children should be seen and not heard... *Urban Geography*, 17(3), 205-220.
- Waiton, S. (2001). *Scared of the kids? Curfews, crime and the regulation of young people*. Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University.
- Walby, K. (2006). Little England? The rise of open-street Closed Circuit Television surveillance in Canada. *Surveillance and Society*, 4(1/2): 29-51.
- Watson, S. (2006). *City Publics-The (dis)enchancements of urban encounters*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Wells, H., Allard, T., & Wilson, P. (2006). *Crime and CCTV in Australia: Understanding the Relationship*. Gold Coast Queensland: Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology: Bond University, Australia.
- White, R., & Wyn, J. (2004). *Youth and Society, exploring the social dynamics of youth experience*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- White, R. (1990). *No Space of Their Own-Young People and Social Control in Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- White, R. (1992). Public Space. *Australian Youth Issues*, 14(2), 123-241.
- White, R. (1996). 'No-go in the fortress city: Young people, inequality and space'. *Urban Policy and Research*, 14(1), 37-50.
- White, R. (2001). Youth Participation in Designing Public Spaces. *Youth Studies Australia*, 20(1), 19-26.

Wilson, D., Rose, J. & Colvin, E. (2010) Marginalised Young People, Surveillance & Public Space. Youth Affairs Council of Victoria.

Wilson, D. & Sutton, A. (2003). *Open-Street CCTV in Australia: A comparative study of establishment and operation*. Melbourne: Department of Criminology, University of Melbourne.

Wrennal, L. (2010) Surveillance and Child Protection: De-mystifying the Trojan Horse, *Surveillance and Society*, 7(3/4): 304-324.

Zurawski, N. & Czerwinski, S. (2008). Crime, Maps and Meaning: Views from a Survey on Safety and CCTV in Germany. *Surveillance and Society*, 5(1): 51-72.